

ORIGINAL



0000163663

July 9, 2015

Regarding: **DOCKET #E-01345A-13-0248**

RECEIVED

Dear Chairwoman Bitter Smith and Commissioners,

2015 JUL 14 P 4: 55

My name is Dr. Jack S. Tuber, and also on behalf of my wife Dr. Joy Schechtman Tuber, we are writing to urge you to vote "no" to the APS proposal to increase the penalty on rooftop solar. We reside at 9139 N. 64<sup>th</sup> Place, Paradise Valley, AZ 85253, and we have had rooftop solar for over three years.

Last year, Arizona Public Service (APS) initiated a direct attack on rooftop solar by proposing a huge penalty--\$50-100 per month--on new solar installations. The Commission wisely rejected that proposal but did approve a \$5 per month penalty.

Now, APS is back, asking for a four-fold increase to the rooftop solar penalty, increasing it from \$5 per month to \$21 per month. APS argues that ratepayers who install solar are not paying their fair share of fixed costs (construction from power plants, transmission lines and associated infrastructure). This ignores all of the benefits that solar customers provide to the grid and to our communities, including less water use, less pollution and less need for additional power plants and other infrastructure. It also ignores the fact that APS already makes a profit on the electricity over-production generated by solar customers during the daytime hours which happens to be the highest rates during peak-demand.

Utility customers who install rooftop solar don't just save grid electricity. Solar customers add reliability to the grid by reducing vulnerability to unplanned outages at power plants. Plus, they add energy during the day, when demand is high and when it is more expensive for utilities to generate or buy electricity. One could even argue that rooftop solar helps national security by thwarting terrorist attacks on the nation's infrastructure by decentralizing the power supply. But, unlike the utilities, rooftop solar customers do not pass on either fixed or operating costs.

Arizona has some of the best opportunities for solar in the country. We are already experiencing the negative impacts of global climate disruption in the form of higher temperatures, extended drought, more extreme weather and larger and more intense forest fires. It makes sense for Arizona and Arizona's utilities to invest in low-carbon solar energy and energy efficiency to reduce carbon pollution. And this does not even mention the deleterious health effects of carbon pollution including increased morbidity and mortality of which we, as physicians, are so keenly aware.

There has been significant discussion about the need to address the issue of the costs and benefits of solar in a rate case. I agree that this is the appropriate procedure for considering this, so more information on the benefits of solar can be part of the decision making process.

Please reject the APS proposed penalty on solar and keep Arizona's solar on track. Thank you.

Jack S. Tuber, D.O. and Joy Schechtman, D.O.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUL 14 2015

DOCKETED BY